UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/736,344	12/15/2000	Tetsuya Yokoyama	862.C2080	8625

5514 7590 06/02/2005

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER	
SINGH, SATWANT K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/736,344	YOKOYAMA, TETSUYA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Satwant K. Singh	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 December 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4,6,9,11,14,16 and 19-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4,6,9,11,14,16 and 19-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☒ Other: Detailed action

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1, 6, 11, 19, 21, 24, 26, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification fails to support the input step of inputting a type of failure of the print job to be aborted or suspended. Page 16, lines 5-9 only addresses the actions to be taken by the user/operator in the case of the print job failure, but fails to specify that the user is inputting the failure

Response to Amendment

3. This is in response to the Amendment filed on December 13, 2004.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6, 11, 19, 21, 24, 26, 27, and 28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 11, 14, 16, and 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakai et al. (US 6,081,342) in view of Nomura et al. (US 6,421,509).

7. Regarding Claim 1, Nakai et al disclose a print processing method for executing print processing upon exchanging print information with a device connected via a network, comprising: a step of submitting print information (image data are transferred), which has been generated by one device (digital copying machine 92), to another device and starting a print job (col. 21, lines 62-67 and col. 22, lines 1-18); a detection step of detecting whether a failure (transmission error) has occurred on the side of the one device during the submission of the print information (takes too long for the digital copying machine 93 to return the image data due to an error on the transmission line) (col. 32, lines 15-19); step determining to abort (Fig. 31, S203) or, suspend (Fig 31, S204) (col. 36, lines 41-64) processing of the print job, which is currently being submitted, in accordance with the detection made in said detection step; and step of reporting abort (Fig. 31, S203) or, suspension (Fig 31, S204) of processing to the other device (digital copying machine 93), which receives the of control of the print job in accordance with the determination made (col. 36, lines 41-64).

Nakai et al fail to teach a print processing method for executing print processing upon exchanging print information with a device connected via a network comprising: an input step of inputting a type of failure of the print job to be aborted and a type of failure of the print job to be suspended via an input unit.

Nomura et al teach a print processing method for executing print processing upon exchanging print information with a device connected via a network comprising: an input step of inputting a type of failure of the print job to be aborted and a type of failure of the print job to be suspended via an input unit (Fig. 7, INTERRUPT, Fig. 8, STOP/DELETE).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Nakai with the teaching of Nomura to allow for the user/operator to interrupt or stop/delete a print job.

8. Regarding Claim 4, Nakai et al disclose a method wherein in a case where a failure (transmission error) that occurred is eliminated at detection performed at said step for detecting (takes too long for the digital copying machine 93 to return the image data due to an error on the transmission line) whether a failure (transmission error) has occurred, said determining step includes determining to resume processing of the suspended print job (Fig. 31, S204) (col. 36, lines 41-64).

9. Claims 6 and 11 are rejected for the same reason as claim 1.

10. Claims 9 and 14 are rejected for the same reason as claim 4.

11. Regarding Claim 16, Nakai et al disclose a system wherein devices connected via the network include a copier (digital copying machine 92 and digital copying machine 93).

12. Regarding Claim 19, Nakai et al disclose a printing control apparatus for transmitting print information via a network to cause another apparatus to perform printing comprising: submitting means for submitting a print job to the other apparatus (image data are transferred), said print job consisting of print information that has been generated by scanning in a document (digital copying machine 30 includes a scanner section 31 serving as a image input section) (col. 7, lines 21-25); detection means for detecting a failure occurring in the printing control apparatus during the submission of the print information (takes too long for the digital copying machine 93 to return the image data due to an error on the transmission line) (col. 32, lines 15-19); determination means for determining whether the failure detected by said detection means is the type of the print job to be aborted (Fig. 31, S203) (col. 36, lines 41-64; and command transmitting means for transmitting command to abort processing of currently submitted print job (Fig 31. S203) to the other apparatus in accordance with failure (transmission error) that has occurred in a case where said determination means determines that the failure detected by said detection means is the type of failure of the print job to be aborted (direct request-receiver machine to cancel data processing and erase stored image data) (col. 36, lines 41-64).

Nakai et al fail to teach a printing control apparatus for transmitting print information via a network to cause another apparatus to perform printing comprising: an input step of inputting a type of failure of the print job to be aborted.

Nomura et al a printing control apparatus for transmitting print information via a network to cause another apparatus to perform printing comprising: an input step of inputting a type of failure of the print job to be aborted. (Fig. 7, INTERRUPT, Fig. 8, STOP/DELETE).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Nakai with the teaching of Nomura to allow for the user/operator to interrupt or stop/delete a print job.

13. Claims 20, 22, and 25 are rejected for the same reason as claim 16.

14. Regarding Claim 21, Nakai et al disclose a printing control apparatus for transmitting print information via a network to cause another apparatus to perform printing, comprising: submitting means for submitting a print job to the other apparatus (image data is transferred), said print job consisting of print information that has been generated by scanning in a document (digital copying machine 30 includes a scanner section 31 serving as a image input section) (col. 7, lines 21-25); detection means for detecting a failure occurring in the printing control apparatus during the submission of the print information (takes too long for the digital copying machine 93 to return the image data due to an error on the transmission line) (col. 32, lines 15-19); determination means for determining whether the failure detected by said detection means is the type of the print job to be suspended (Fig 31, S204) (col. 36, lines 41-64); and command

transmitting means for transmitting command to suspend processing of currently submitted print job (Fig 31. S204) to the other apparatus in accordance with a failure (transmission error) that has occurred in a case where said determination means determines that the failure detected by said detections means is the type of failure of the print job to be suspended (direct request-receiver machine to cancel data processing and erase stored image data) (col. 36, lines 41-64).

Nakai et al fail to teach a printing control apparatus for transmitting print information via a network to cause another apparatus to perform printing comprising: an input step of inputting a type of failure of the print job to be suspended.

Nomura et al a printing control apparatus for transmitting print information via a network to cause another apparatus to perform printing comprising: an input step of inputting a type of failure of the print job to be suspended. (Fig. 7, INTERRUPT, Fig. 8, STOP/DELETE).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Nakai with the teaching of Nomura to allow for the user/operator to interrupt or stop/delete a print job.

15. Regarding Claim 23, Nakai et al teach an apparatus, wherein said command transmitting means transmits a command to resume processing of a currently submitted print job to the other apparatus in accordance with elimination of the failure (direct request-receiver machine to continue job or suspend job until trouble is removed) (col. 36, lines 41-64); and the other apparatus halts processing of the currently submitted print job until a command to resume processing of the print job is received following

receipt of the command to suspend processing of the print job(direct request-receiver machine to continue job or suspend job until trouble is removed) (col. 36, lines 41-64).

16. Regarding Claim 24, Nakai et al disclose a printing control apparatus for transmitting print information via a network to cause another apparatus to perform printing comprising: submitting means for submitting a print job to the other apparatus (image data are transferred), said print job consisting of print information that has been generated by scanning in a document (digital copying machine 30 includes a scanner section 31 serving as a image input section) (col. 7, lines 21-25); detection means for detecting a failure occurring in the printing control apparatus during the submission of the print information; determination means for determining whether the failure detected by said detection means is the type of the print job to be aborted or the type of failure of the print job to be suspended; and command transmitting means for transmitting command to abort or a command to suspend processing of the currently submitted print job to the other apparatus in accordance with the determination made by said determination means (direct request-receiver machine to cancel data processing and erase stored image data) (col. 36, lines 41-64).

Nakai et al fail to teach a printing control apparatus for transmitting print information via a network to cause another apparatus to perform printing comprising: an input step of inputting a type of failure of the print job to be aborted and a type of failure of the print job to be suspended.

Nomura et al a printing control apparatus for transmitting print information via a network to cause another apparatus to perform printing comprising: an input step of

inputting a type of failure of the print job to be aborted and a type of failure of the print job to be suspended. (Fig. 7, INTERRUPT, Fig. 8, STOP/DELETE).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Nakai with the teaching of Nomura to allow for the user/operator to interrupt or stop/delete a print job.

17. Claim 26 is rejected for the same reason as claim 19.

18. Claim 27 is rejected for the same reason as claim 21.

19. Claim 28 is rejected for the same reason as claim 24.

Conclusion

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Contact* Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satwant K. Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly A. Williams can be reached on (571) 272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satwant Singh

sks

Satwant K. Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2626

MARK WALLERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER